

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 are pending in this application. Claim 1 is the only independent claim.

Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully solicited.

Personal Interview

Applicant wishes to thank Examiner Kim for the courtesies extended to Applicant's representative, Carolyn Baumgardner, during the April 6, 2006 personal interview. During the interview, the differences between the claimed invention and the Wang reference were discussed. Examiner Kim noted at the end of the personal interview that applicant's arguments regarding how the prior art fails to anticipate the present invention was persuasive. (see Interview Summary). Further substance of the personal interview is summarized in the following remarks.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant notes with appreciation the indication on page 3 of the Office Action that claims 5 and 6 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. However, Applicant respectfully submits that this is not necessary in view of the following remarks.

The Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter

The Office Action rejects:

(1) claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,160,571 to Wang (hereafter Wang); and

(2) claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,433,639 to Numanami et al. (hereafter Numanami).

These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Applicant respectfully submits that the claimed invention is distinguishable from the cited art, Wang, for at least the following reasons:

The Examiner alleges that Wang discloses a low-pass filter (90) connected to an output of the gain control and intermediate frequency amplifying circuit (84). (see Office Action, page 2 and Wang's Fig. 2). Applicant disagrees with this allegation.

For example, applicant submits that Wang fails to disclose a low-pass filter for outputting unbalanced signals, as set forth in claim 1. In the present invention, the output circuit includes an unbalanced/balanced converting circuit for converting unbalanced signals of an output of the low-pass filter to balanced signals. As such, the signal propagating through the circuit in the present invention is an unbalanced signal until it reaches the unbalanced/balanced converting circuit in the output circuit.

In contrast with the present invention, Wang fails to disclose a low-pass filter that outputs unbalanced signals. Instead, Wang merely discloses that differential data signals are outputted from the AGC device and the differential signals are then passed through a low-pass filter 90 to a video amp 92. The differential data signals are provided to the video amplifier 92 as a final buffer and the data driver outputs the data signal on the RX OUT1 and RX OUT2 data lines. (see Wang, Fig. 2; and col. 9, line 64 to col. 10, line 3).

The Examiner himself concedes that "differential signals" are balanced signals. (see Office Action, page 3). As such, in Wang's system the signal propagating through the circuit, i.e., outputted from the low-pass filter 90, is a balanced signal, not an unbalanced signal, as set forth in the claimed invention.

As a result, Wang fails to teach or suggest a circuit that propagates an unbalanced signal throughout, especially the output of the low-pass filter, as set forth in the claimed invention.

For at least the reasons noted above, applicant submits that Wang fails to anticipate the present invention as set forth in claims 1-3.

According to MPEP §2131, "a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art

reference.” *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. Of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051 (Fed. Cir. 1987). “The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ...claims.” *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claims, but this is not an *ipsissimis verbis* test, i.e., identity of terminology is not required. *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action has failed to establish the required *prima facie* case of anticipation because the cited reference, Wang, fails to teach or suggest each and every feature as set forth in the claimed invention.

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 is allowable over Wang for at least the reasons noted above.

As for each of the dependent claims not particularly discussed above, these claims are also allowable for at least the reasons set forth above regarding their corresponding independent claims, and/or for the further features claimed therein.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) is respectfully solicited.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Applicant further submits that the claimed invention is distinguishable from the combination of Wang and Numanami for at least the following reasons:

Applicant respectfully submits that Numanami fails to make up for the deficiencies found in Wang noted above. As such, the combination of Wang and Numanami also fails to teach or suggest each and every feature as set forth in the claimed invention.

Applicant respectfully submits that neither Wang nor Numanami, taken singularly or in combination, (assuming these teachings may be combined, which applicant does not admit) teach or suggest a circuit that propagates an unbalanced signal throughout, especially the output of the low-pass filter.

To establish a *prima facie* case of Obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art and not based on applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). See MPEP 706.02(j).

Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of cited references fail to teach or suggest each and every feature as set forth in the claimed invention.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

Conclusion


In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Carolyn T. Baumgardner (Reg. No. 41,345) at (703) 205-8000 **to schedule a Personal Interview.**

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment from or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. §1.17; particularly, the extension of time fees.

Dated: April 6, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By  41,345
for Terrell C. Birch
Registration No.: 19,382
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant